



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/666,083

09/19/2003

Boris Prokopenko

252209-2100

8438

24504

7590

01/08/2007

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW
STE 1750
ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948

EXAMINER

GEIB, BENJAMIN P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2181

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/08/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/666,083

Applicant(s)

PROKOPENKO ET AL.

Examiner

Benjamin P. Geib

Art Unit

2181

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-7, 9-22, and 25 as indicated in final Office Action.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.


FRITZ FLEMING
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

11/3/2007

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner "has not shown within particularity how Bratt teaches of a data converter that converts vectors from a time serial to a time parallel format", the examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner has not "merely stated that Bratt performs matrix transposition", as asserted by the applicant, but has shown how the matrix transposition performed by Bratt reads upon the claim language. The applicant cites column 5, lines 29-35 of Bratt as evidence that Bratt does not teach "A data converter for converting a group of vectors from a time serial to a time parallel format, wherein in the time serial format, sets of corresponding components of the vectors each have a time slot, and in time parallel format, each vector has a time slot". However, the cited section of Bratt is background information describing matrix transposition in the prior art and not the invention of Bratt relied upon in the rejection. In particular, cited section refers to performing matrix transposition on a scalar CPU, whereas the invention of Bratt relied upon in the rejection is matrix transposition on a vector processor (see column 52, lines 17-19).

The applicant argues that Bratt does not teach "an input rotator configured to rotate each set of corresponding components of all time serial vectors by an amount that depends on the time slot of the set of corresponding components". As noted by the applicant, the section of Bratt cited by the examiner (i.e. column 50, lines 56-62 and Fig. 75) describes changing the positions of elements within rows or within columns. As described in the cited section, this changing of positions is a rotate operation and, therefore, the components that implement the operation are an input rotator. The applicant indicates that examiner appears to equate "a row of elements" with "time serial vectors". The examiner notes for clarification that it is a "set of corresponding components of all time serial vectors" that is equated with "a row of elements". Each row of elements (i.e. corresponding components of all time serial vectors) is rotated by an amount that depends on the row number (i.e. time slot) (see column 50, lines 56-62; Fig. 75). Therefore, Bratt has taught "an input rotator configured to rotate each set of corresponding components of all time serial vectors by an amount that depends on the time slot of the set of corresponding components"..